

provided to the official draftsman concurrently herewith and, therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7-9, 17, 18, 21-25, 33 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,018,724 to Arent.

Arent discloses a method for authenticating on-line transactions. The method is intended to address situations where a customer requests a proof of certification of a merchant. According to the Arent method, a certification authority must have pre-certified the merchant and provided the merchant with a digital certificate. In response to a customer's request for proof of certification, the Arent method contemplates that the merchant provides a digital certificate to the customer. The customer verifies the authenticity of the digital certificate with a software key which is publicly available. The software key may be unique to the customer. For subsequent transactions, a merchant sends the same digital certificate to customer(s) and the customer(s) once again utilize the same software key for verification. Further, according to the Arent method, a plurality of merchants all utilize the same digital certificate and a plurality of customers repeatedly utilize the same, albeit unique, software keys for verification. Of note, the digital certificate and the software keys are not identical.

In contrast, Claim 1 recites a system including at least two parts or stations wherein a transaction or connection between any two or more of the parts or stations is conducted or established by means of an access code. The access code is available to an accessed part or station and requires an identical access code to be provided to an accessing part or station at the time of conducting the transaction or establishing the connection. The access code is one of a plurality of codes provided to the accessed part or station and available to the accessing part or station. The access code is selected from the plurality of codes at the time of conducting the transaction or

establishing the connection such that no two transactions are conducted or no two connections are established with the same access code. Consequently, each access code is unique, stored at two locations and only used once, thereby significantly increasing the security and reliability of the transaction and environment. Arent does not disclose or suggest such a system configuration. Accordingly, Claim 1 and each of the claims depending therefrom distinguish the subject invention from Arent and, therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to Claim 17, a method of conducting a transaction or establishing a connection between at least two parts or stations by means of an access code is recited. The access code is available to an accessed part or station at the time of conducting the transaction or establishing the connection and requiring an identical access code to be provided to an accessing part or station. The method includes the steps of making available a plurality of codes to the accessed and the accessing parts or stations, selecting, at the time of conducting the transaction or establishing the connection, one code from the plurality of codes. The method further includes the steps of using the selected code to conduct the transaction or establish the connection such that no two transactions are conducted or no two connections are established with the same access code. Consequently, each access code is unique, stored at two locations and only used once. Arent does not disclose or suggest such a method. The presently claimed method thus provides enhanced security and reliability to transactional communications. Accordingly, Claim 17 and each of the claims depending therefrom distinguish over Arent and, therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 14, 16, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,018,724 to Arent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,696,909 to Wallner.

As noted above, Arent discloses a merchant-provided digital certificate methodology in which the certificate is verified with a customer software key. The digital certificate and the software key are not the same. According to the Arent methodology, neither the digital certificate nor the software key are modified, varied or altered during repeated use.

Wallner discloses a virtual terminal for processing transactions.

With respect to Claims 14 and 16, it is respectfully submitted that Wallner does not overcome the deficiencies of Arent, as noted above with respect to Claim 1. In particular, neither Arent nor Wallner disclose or suggest, either alone or in combination, in whole or in part, a system including, *inter alia*, at least two stations wherein the access code is one of a plurality of codes provided to the accessed station and available to the accessing station, the access code being selected from the plurality of codes at the time of conducting the transaction such that no two transactions are conducted with the same access code as recited by Claim 1. Consequently, according to the presently claimed system, each access code is unique, stored at two locations and only used once. Accordingly, Claims 14 and 16 are not rendered obvious by the combination of references and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With respect to Claims 30 and 32, it is respectfully submitted that Wallner does not overcome the deficiencies of Arent, as noted above with respect to Claim 17. In particular, neither Arent nor Wallner disclose or suggest, either alone or in combination, in whole or in part, a method including, *inter alia*, the steps of conducting a transaction between at least two parts by means of an access code, the method including the steps of making available a plurality of codes to the accessed and the accessing parts or stations, selecting, at the time of conducting the transaction or establishing the connection, one

code from the plurality of codes and using the selected code to conduct the transaction or establish the connection such that no two transactions are conducted or no two connections are established with the same access code as recited by Claim 17. Consequently, each access code is unique, stored at two locations and only used once. Accordingly, Claims 30 and 32 are not rendered obvious by the combination of references and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 10 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,018,724 to Arent.

As noted above, Arent discloses a merchant-provided digital certificate which is verified with a customer software key. The digital certificate and the software key are not the same. Neither the digital certificate nor the software key are modified during repeated use.

It is respectfully submitted that Arent does not disclose or suggest, in whole or in part, a system including, *inter alia*, at least two stations wherein a transaction between any two stations is conducted by means of an access code, the access code being available to an accessed station and requiring an identical access code to be provided to an accessing station at the time of conducting the transaction, wherein the access code is one of a plurality of codes provided to the accessed station and available to the accessing station, the access code being selected from the plurality of codes at the time of conducting the transaction such that no two transactions are conducted with the same access code as recited by Claim 1. Consequently, each access code is unique, stored at two locations and only used once. Accordingly, Claim 10 is not rendered obvious by Arent and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With respect to Claim 26, it is respectfully submitted that Arent does not disclose or suggest, in whole or in part, a method including the steps of conducting a transaction or establishing a connection between at least two parts or stations by means of an access code, the access code being available to an accessed part or station at the time of conducting the transaction or establishing the connection and requiring an identical access code to be provided to an accessing part or station, the method including the steps of making available a plurality of codes to the accessed and the accessing parts or stations, selecting, at the time of conducting the transaction or establishing the connection, one code from the plurality of codes and using the selected code to conduct the transaction or establish the connection such that no two transactions are conducted or no two connections are established with the same access code as recited by Claim 17. Consequently, each access code is unique, stored at two locations and only used once. Accordingly, Claim 26 is not rendered obvious by the reference cited by the Examiner and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 3, 4, 11-13, 15, 19, 20, 27-29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,018,724 to Arent in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,630,201 to White.

As noted above, Arent discloses a merchant-provided digital certificate which is verified with a customer software key. The digital certificate and the software key are not the same. Neither the digital certificate nor the software key are modified, varied or altered during repeated use.

White discloses an on-line transaction security system having a portable transaction device 34 and a central processor 20. The transaction device 34 receives a smart memory card to conduct a transaction. At the time of transaction, the transaction device 34 and the central processor 20 each generate a security code by algorithmically

combining a transaction number (e.g., check number) and a random number. Upon generation of the security code, the transaction device 34 transmits its security code to the central processor 20 where it is compared with the security code generated by the central processor 20.

It is respectfully submitted that White does not overcome the deficiencies of Arent, as noted above with respect to Claim 1. In particular, neither Arent nor White disclose or suggest, either alone or in combination, in whole or in part, a system including, *inter alia*, at least two stations wherein a transaction between any two stations is conducted by means of an access code, the access code being available to an accessed station and requiring an identical access code to be provided to an accessing station at the time of conducting the transaction, wherein the access code is one of a plurality of codes provided to the accessed station and available to the accessing station, the access code being selected from the plurality of codes at the time of conducting the transaction such that no two transactions are conducted with the same access code as recited by Claim 1. Consequently, each access code is unique, only used once and stored at the two parts prior to the time of transaction. The codes of the subject claim are used directly without algorithmic calculation. Thus, the use of codes directly is more efficient than that of the Arent and/or White methodology. Accordingly, Claims 3, 4, 11-13 and 15, at least by virtue of their dependency upon Claim 1, are not rendered obvious by the combination of references and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

With respect to Claims 19, 20, 27-29 and 31, it is respectfully submitted that White does not overcome the deficiencies of Arent, as noted above with respect to Claim 17. In particular, neither Arent nor White disclose or suggest, either alone or in combination, in whole or in part, a method including the steps of conducting a transaction


or establishing a connection between at least two parts by an access code as recited in Claim 17. The access code being available to an accessed part or station at the time of conducting the transaction or establishing the connection and requiring an identical access code to be provided to an accessing part. The method including the steps of making available a plurality of codes to the accessed and the accessing parts, selecting, at the time of conducting the transaction or establishing the connection, one code from the plurality of codes and using the selected code to conduct the transaction or establish the connection such that no two transactions are conducted or no two connections are established with the same access code as recited by Claim 17. Consequently, each access code is unique, stored at two locations prior to the time of transaction and only used once. The codes of the subject claim are used directly without algorithmic calculation. Thus, the use of mere selection of codes at the time of transaction is more efficient than that of the Arent and/or White methodology. Accordingly, Claims 19, 20, 27-29 and 31, at least by virtue of their dependency upon Claim 17, are not rendered obvious by the combination of references and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or overpayments due as a result of filing the present paper may be applied to Deposit Account No. 11-0231. It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now remaining in this application, namely Claims 1-32 and 35, are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would facilitate the resolution of any remaining matters the undersigned attorney may be contacted at the number set forth hereinbelow.

Respectfully submitted,

Date : May 24, 2001


George N. Chaclas, Reg. No. 46,608
Cummings & Lockwood
Attorney for Applicants
Four Stamford Plaza
P.O. Box 120
Stamford, CT 06904-0120
Tel. No. (203) 351-4103

.StmLib1:886794.1 05/23/01